

Interim Council of Faculty of Fine Arts

Minutes - April 11, 1975

PRESENT: Dean A. Pinsky (Chairman); Professor J. Bordan,
Professors D. Andrus, F. Barry, P. Cohen, G. Chalmers,
E.F. Cooke, M. Dewes, J. Goguen, G. Gross, H. George,
A. Herman, S. Horner, D. Jones, J. Kelly, C. Lacki,
P. Landsley, J. Locke, J. Miller, H. Mongrain, S. Paikowsky,
B. Reznicek, L. Sherman, J. Smoke, J.I. Smith, P. Spensley,
N. Springford, J. Turner, B. Wainwright, G. Walters
Registrar: Mr. K. Adams
Librarian's Rep: Mr. Michael Hood
Day Students: Miss E. Garsonnin, Miss C. Maher, Miss N. Abate
Fac. of Arts Rep: Prof. B. Slack

1. The Interim Council was called to order at 9:40 a.m. The Chairman noted that for the purposes of this meeting, the quorum would be fifty percent of the total council membership plus one.

2. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman announced that the first meeting of the Interim Council of the Faculty of Fine Arts was an historic occasion, marking a new phase in the development of Fine Arts at this University. Hopefully the Council would prove to be a very useful and meaningful assembly, and would make its contribution to the University as a whole.

He noted that the Fine Arts Interim Faculty Council would continue to exist until it decided on the permanent composition for its membership. The Council had until September, 1976 to decide on what sort of representation it would like to have and report to Senate on the proposed composition of the Faculty Council. However, he expressed the hope that this could be done by September, 1975.

Senate Approved Membership of Interim Faculty Council
(Doc. FAFC 7475-4-D1)

Dean Pinsky introduced this document outlining the composition of the Interim Faculty Council. Outside members of the Interim Council were then introduced as follows;

The Library delegate, Professor Michael Hood, the Registrar, Mr. Ken Adams, Fine Art Student Representatives, Miss E. Garsonnin, Miss C. Maher and Miss Nancy Abate, and the Faculty of Arts Representative, Professor B. Slack.

3. Professor J. Bordan, Vice-Rector, Academic

Dean Pinsky introduced Professor Bordan to the Council. Professor Bordan stated that the Board of Governors had approved the Interim Faculty Council membership and that the Interim Council was formally in effect as a legal body as of March 15, 1975 for the purpose initially of curriculum planning. He explained that it became the Council for all purposes as of June 1, 1975. He then outlined the legal position of Faculty Council to Senate. Under this new arrangement, the Fine Arts representation would include the Dean of the Faculty of Fine Arts, two Faculty members approved from the Faculty of Fine Arts, one Undergraduate Day student and one Undergraduate evening student. He further explained the responsibilities of Faculty Councils and their relationship to Senate.

Faculty Council is the body responsible for initiating all programmes and curriculum developments in the Faculty. It does not have final authority for new programmes, or new courses, but all substantial changes or additional courses are approved by Faculty Council before they are forwarded to Senate. Senate does not initiate new programmes and cannot make changes in already existing programmes, however, it does have veto power, but, this is rarely used. He pointed out that most recommendations from Faculty Councils are approved.

He further explained that Faculty Council had no authority over personnel or budget matters. However, the Council, does make recommendations that effect budget and it must, therefore, be aware of budget implications in any proposal it put forward to Senate.

Regarding student requests, the Council made its own decisions, however, Senate reserves an appeal role.

He emphasized that in the final analysis, Senate and Council had a right to make any recommendations they wished and on any issue.

Questions from the Floor

Prof. S. Paikowsky wanted to know what relationship, if any, existed between the various Faculty Councils. Specifically, if one Faculty felt that another Faculty should be putting on a certain programme, how could they go about seeing that this was done?

Professor Bordan explained that such issues would ideally be handled on an informal basis and that discussions should take place between faculties and faculty members. He noted, however, that each Faculty Council had the power to initiate any programme it wished.

Regarding membership on the Board of Senate, Prof. Pinsky emphasized the importance of this position in that there were often important issues which needed to be brought back to Faculty Council for consideration.

Professor Bordan explained further the responsibilities of members of Senate and specifically that the Dean was the spokesman of Faculty to Senate and that faculty members were University people representing the point of view of the University. He noted that members needed to be able to participate in debates which often occurred at Senate meetings.

He told Council that the Board of Governors had approved a number of special items for Fine Arts, on his recommendation, having to do with personnel policy matters. He explained that the personnel policy that would apply to the University Faculty of Fine Arts, until such time as a Concordia policy came into place, would be the policies set out in the Sir George Williams Faculty Handbook. The Loyola Faculty Handbook would not apply to this Faculty. The application of these policies, where it applies to personnel would be the responsibility of the Vice-Rector, Academic. In addition, the Sir George Williams Association of University Teachers had been replaced by the Concordia Association of Teachers. He noted also that all new appointments into the Faculty of Fine Arts would be governed by the Sir George Williams Pension Plan.

Prof. N. Springford wanted to know how long the term of office for a Senator lasted?

Prof. Bordan explained that it was a three year term, and noted that when two Senators were appointed, one term should be for three years and the other for two years, so that a continuity could be maintained.

Professor Cooke wished to know why no reciprocal arrangement had been made for representatives of Fine Art faculty to be privy to the discussions on other faculty councils in the University?

Professor Bordan explained that Fine Arts Council had the authority to make this request to Senate and also noted that there were other mechanisms which could be used to accomplish the same thing. For instance, other councils have open meetings to which anyone can attend and, also, requests could be made to other councils for speaking arrangements, without votes.

Professor Gross told Council that such an interim arrangement had been made with the Loyola Faculty of Arts & Science and that Professor Reznicek was representing Fine Arts on that Council.

Professor Cooke wanted to know how the responsibility for budget and personnel was dealt with within the Faculty?

Professor Bordan explained that, legally, the budget is established in the Rector's cabinet. Administrative budgets are made up, firstly, of non-debatable costs, which includes Library. Once these costs are taken into account, an amount is ultimately allocated to an academic function which is then allocated to each Dean. The Deans can then allocate funds to their respective Department Chairmen. He wished to emphasize that budgets were not established on a formula basis but were allocated with some information from the Deans as to what money was required. Essentially, the decision process required a great deal of communication between the Faculty Dean and himself.

Professor Cooke noted then, that, at the level of Faculty, the Faculty Council could make budget recommendations, but the ultimate arbitor then became the Dean and the Department Chairmen.

Professor Bordan explained that Faculty Council could not vote on the spending of budget and University resources.

Professor Cooke asked whether the problem of space resources was dealt with through his office?

Professor Bordan said yes, and explained that there was a protocol to be followed. He emphasized that two channels were involved in that both himself, and Professor Petolas had to be notified of any space requests. He said that many problems would be eliminated if he was not by-passed in this regard.

Professor Reznicek wanted to know what procedures were to be followed in the absence of any Departments. Were any requests to be made through the existing Department Chairmen?

Professor Bordan said that the Dean could recommend to the Vice-Rector on the appointment of Department Chairmen and explained that there was a Vice-Rector's office guideline for such matters.

Professor Pinsky explained that until appropriate changes were made, the existing Department structures with each Department Chairmen, would be maintained so that problems could be handled in an appropriate manner. In the next week he would be asking the Chairmen to meet on a weekly basis, so that important issues would be taken care of.

Professor Cooke asked Professor Bordan when the Dean's Office and his support staff would be set into place?

Professor Bordan said that he had experienced many problems with regard to the allocation of space for next year and explained that there was a timing difficulty which would prevent implementation of these plans as quickly as he had hoped.

Professor Gross explained to Council that members on the "small" campus were more sensitive to the problems which existed in the two-campus structure and were especially concerned with the problems of exchanging teachers, students working on both campuses and about whether these changes could be implemented in time for the coming academic year. He wished that something could be done soon to make the merger more of a reality.

In this connection, Mr. Ken Adams explained that, for the moment, there was no across-the-board University registration.

Professor Bordan mentioned that there were such mechanisms already in place. For instance, he explained that Engineering had a separate registration but were registering in the same programs. The first year program in Engineering was identical on both campuses. He emphasized that it was essential to remember that this was a University of Concordia, not Loyola or Sir George even though academic regulations had still to be resolved. He noted that Commerce had maintained two different programmes.

Professor Sherman said that there were many problems concerning the integration of two campuses and that perhaps the people involved at this moment didn't have to wait for formal structures but could make their own decisions.

Professor Bordan agreed and said that certain ways had been found by other faculties. However, he wished to point out that it had taken these faculties at least two years to sort them out.

Professor Bordan announced that his delegate to future Fine Art Faculty Council meetings would be Prof. D. McDougall.

Before leaving Professor Bordan asked that each member of Council introduce himself since he noted that there were many people in attendance that he had not met.

On behalf of the members of Council, Professor Pinsky thanked Professor Bordan for attending the meeting and expressed best wishes to him on his pending sabbatical leave.

Professor Pinsky announced that items 6, 7 and 8 of the Agenda would be withdrawn due to the already lengthy duration of the meeting. He noted that members of Council would receive Senate documents beforehand so that they could be read and members could come prepared to discuss them. He proposed, instead of the first Friday of every month, that Council meet on the second Friday of every month. This was necessary because documents did not arrive from Senate in time for proper distribution for Council meetings. There will be a meeting of Council in May and one in June which would be the last one for the academic year.

5. Graduation Arrangements

Professor Pinsky announced that Graduation was scheduled to take place the evening of June 11th in H-110. As each Faculty was responsible for its own convocation, a Committee had to be organized to serve for this year.

Professor Sherman explained that the Committee should consist of at least three people, and should represent various disciplines and that there should be someone from the studio area and one other from another area.

Since there were no volunteers, Professor Ellen James and Jerome Krause were nominated in absentia.

4. Reports on Senate Business

(b) Proposed New Grading System
(Doc. FAFC 7475-4-D2)

Professor Pinsky noted that a proposal had been forwarded to Senate by the Committee on Standards to look at all academic regulations and establish and set up priorities. Its mandate was to come up with an "appropriate" grading system that reflected the practices and procedures on both campuses. Main differences consisted of numerical and alphabetical values.

He noted that this document would be reproduced and sent out immediately to all members of Council and Senate would be informed that it had not had time to consider it. He asked for support on a nomination to continue with the same grading system for the present.

- * Motion: Professor J. Smoke motioned to oppose the proposed system until the Council had had time to read and discuss it and was seconded by Professor P. Cohen. CARRIED

(c) Para-academic Grades
(Doc. FAFC 7475-4-D3)

Professor Pinsky made some comments about this document and after a brief discussion took place the following motion was passed.

- * It was moved by Professor G. Chalmers and seconded by Professor E. Cooke that this document be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee for study. CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.